

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 24-43 are pending, in which claims 6, 13, 16-18, 20 and 21 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and new claims 24-43 have been added. Adequate descriptive support for the present Amendment should be apparent throughout the originally filed disclosure, for example, Abstract, FIGs. 1 and 4B, ¶¶ [0057]-[0059], and [0062]-[0066] of the corresponding US Pub. No. 20050201320. No new matter is introduced.

Claims 6, 13, 17, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness based on *Zhao et al.* (US 20080153500, “*Zhao*”) in view of *Anantha et al.* (US 20050177647, “*Anantha*”). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness based on *Zhao* in view of *Anantha* and *Gielow et al.* (US 20050188406, “*Gielow*”). Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness based on *Zhao* in view of *Anantha* and *El-Beik et al.* (US 20050117595, “*El-Beik*”).

Since claims 6, 13, 16-18, 20 and 21 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, the rejections are rendered moot.

New Claims 24-43

With respect to new claims 24-43, there are fundamental differences between the claimed inventions and the applied references. Specifically, independent claims 24, 31, and 38 recite, *inter alia*: “determining to initiate establishment of a **data session with the terminal via a network address translator or a firewall** in response to receiving the request; causing, at least in part, **registration of a network address assigned to the terminal** associated with the first network **in accordance with establishment of the data session**; ...causing, at least in part,

transmission of **subsequent push content through the network address translator or the firewall** to the terminal based upon **direct subscription** to the push service by the terminal, **the direct subscription occurring after de-registration and then re-registration of the terminal.**”

These features are neither disclosed nor suggested by *Zhao* and *Anantha*. As admitted by the Examiner (p. 4, 4th paragraph of the Office Action), *Zhao* is silent with respect to register a terminal by receiving a registration message from the terminal via a network address translator (NAT) or a firewall (FW).

Anantha was relied upon by the Examiner to provide the missing teachings. However, *Anantha* is silent with respect to a **re-registration** of the terminal associated with a data session established via the NAT or FW. *Anantha* neither discloses or suggests “causing, at least in part, transmission of subsequent push content through the NAT or FW to the terminal based upon **direct subscription** to the push service by the terminal, **the direct subscription occurring after de-registration and then re-registration of the terminal.**”

By way of example, *Anantha*’s enhanced registration request (RRQ), at best, is sent out by a mobile device 104 to an home agent 106, when the mobile device 104 has roamed outside of the private network 102 and seeks to register with the home agent 106 (¶¶ [0033], [0034]). The enhanced registration request is not a **re-registration** of the terminal with respect to a data session via the NAT or FW. As another example, *Anantha*’s defense mechanism against unauthorized access and service attacks denies registration out right (¶¶ [0082]-[0083]). Therefore, there is no first registration to begin with, much less about de-registration or re-registration.

The additional references to *Gielow* and *El-Beik* do not cure the previously argued deficiencies in the attempted combination of *Zhao* and *Anantha*.

It is therefore apparent that even if the applied references are combined as proposed by the Examiner, and Applicants do not agree that the requisite realistic motivation has been established, the inventions recited in the new claims would not result. *Uniroyal, Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp.*, 837 F.2d 1044 (Fed. Cir.1988). Applicants, therefore, submit that new claims 24-43 are patentable in view of the cited references.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (703) 519-9952 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 504213 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG MORI & STEINER, P.C.

December 20, 2010

Date

/Phouphanomketh Ditthavong/

Phouphanomketh Ditthavong

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 44658

918 Prince Street

Alexandria, VA 22314

Tel. (703) 519-9951

Fax (703) 519-9958